

REMARKS

The present response is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 13, 15, 17 and 24 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled as part of the foregoing claim amendments. Therefore, claims 1-24 remain pending in the application.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time and attention afforded by Examiner Nalven during a telephonic interview on August 30, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' representative and Examiner Nalven discussed the claimed invention, the cited references, and the non-anticipatory and the non-obvious nature of the claims in view of the cited references. Applicants' representative proposed amending the claims to further distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references. Examiner Nalven agreed to reconsider the application in view of the proposed amendments. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the claims as discussed during the telephonic interview.

Independent claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077985 ("Kobata") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,921 ("Stefik"). In response to Applicants' previous response dated May 29, 2007, the Office Action contends that Stefik teaches "that rights defined for a folder define how the contents of the folder may be managed" (Office Action dated July 26, 2007 ("Office Action") at p. 2). As such, the Office Action concludes that Stefik discloses defining rights data for a copy of a document based on the rights information of a folder. Although Applicants believe that the present claims patentably define over the cited references, Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the claimed invention.

As amended, claims 1 and 13 recite, in part, receiving a document in a folder and then receiving a request for a copy of the document. The copy of the document is delivered to the requestor with rights data that is dynamically defined using the rights information of the folder. Thus, as noted in the present specification, the claimed embodiments may dynamically apply rights-management protection to a copy of a document that is to be delivered from a document store (*Specification* at ¶¶ [0136] and [0137]).

For example, as further noted in the specification, an individual may create a document that is devoid of any rights data (*id.* at ¶ [0136]). To define rights data for a copy

of the document, the individual may simply place the document in a document store having rights information associated therewith (*id.* at ¶¶ [0136] – [0139]). The document store may then define the rights data for the copy of the document and deliver the rights-protected copy of the document to a requester (*id.* at ¶ [0137]). As an example, the document store’s access controls may be mapped into rights, which are then defined in the document’s rights data section (*id.* at ¶ [0145]).

Stefik, by contrast, does not dynamically define rights data for a document using the rights information of a folder. Rather, Stefik’s document has its own rights, which are attached via an authoring tool.

More specifically, Stefik discloses a document that is stored in a folder (Stefik at col. 10, ll. 64-67). Usage rights and file management rights may be attached to the folder, but the these rights are not attached to the document itself (*id.* at col. 11, ll. 2-8). Rather, Stefik explains that the document in the folder is subject to its own rights (*id.* at col. 11, ll. 5-6). In particular, Stefik notes that the rights may be attached to the document via an “authoring tool or digital work assembling tool.” (*id.* at col. 11, ll. 22-30). In other words, the document’s rights data is not dynamically defined using the rights information of the folder in which the document is received. The document’s rights data is, instead, defined by the document’s author using Stefik’s authoring tool or digital work assembling tool.

Thus, Stefik does not teach or suggest dynamically defining rights data for a copy of a document using the rights information of a folder, as recited in claims 1 and 13. Moreover, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Kobata does not supply the missing teachings of Stefik (Office Action at p. 3).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 13 patentably define over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 6-12, 14 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of Stefik. Claims 3-5 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of Stefik and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,337 (“Xiao”).

As claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, and claims 14-24 depend from claim 13, Applicants further submit that the dependent claims likewise patentably define over the cited

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2185/302760.2
Application No.: 10/632,356
Office Action Dated: July 26, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

references. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejections of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Bryan T. Giles at (215) 564-8954, to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 14, 2007

/Bryan T. Giles/
Bryan T. Giles
Registration No. 60,078

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439